(e) whether in the period 1987-88 to 1990-91 this scheme was implemented in 64% of the primary schools;

(f) if so, what are the remaining areas still to be covered by the scheme; and

(g) why this scheme has not been introduced so far?

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ARJUN SINGH): (a) to (b) Yes, Sir.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) The basic objective of Operation Blackboard, which was started in 1987- 88, was to bring the existing primary schools in the country to a minimum standard of physical facilities by providing them with:—

(i) At least two reasonably large all weather rooms alongwith separate toilet facilities for boys & girls.

(ii) Atleast two teachers, as far as possible one of them a woman; and

(iii) Essential teaching learning material.

(e) Yes, Sir.

(f) and (g) As of now, assistance has been provided under the scheme to 99.9% of the primary schools.

बिना बारी के आबंटन का घपला

*377. **श्री मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला खान आजमी:**

क्या शहरी विकास मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) क्या उनके मंत्रालय में सरकारी आवासों का बिना बारी आबंटन करने का घपला चल रहा है;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि हकदार सरकारी कर्मचारियों को वर्षों तक सरकारी आवास नहीं मिल पा रहा है;

(ग) क्या यह भी सच है कि मकान मालिकों को भी सरकारी आवास आबंटित किये जा रहे हैं;

(घ) क्या ऐसी प्रथा सही हकदार व्यक्तियों के प्रति सरासर अन्याय है; और

(ङ) यदि हां, तो सरकार इस संबंध में क्या कार्यवाही कर रही है?

शहरी विकास मंत्री (श्रीमती शीला कौल) (क) बिना बारी आबंटन सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा नियमों के तहत मंजूर किए जाते हैं;

(ख) पात्र सरकारी कर्मचारियों को, खाली व सुलभ होने और बारी आने पर आवास आबंटित किये जा रहे हैं।

(ग) से (ङ) जी, हां। निजी मकान वाले कार्मिक भी सरकारी आवास आबंटन (सामान्य पूल आवास-दिल्ली) नियमावली, 1963 के प्रावधानों के अनुसार, बारी आने पर साधारण पूल आवास के आबंटन के हकदार हैं।

Urban Poverty Alleviation Programmes

*378. SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI:

SHRI JANARDAN YADAV:

Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have made any assessment of the success of the urban poverty alleviation programmes; if so, what are the salient features and whether any decision has been taken to broadbase the programme;

(b) what is the number of urban poor who have benefited through the programme and whether Government are aware that there have been several drawbacks in the implementation and what are the details thereof; and

(c) what is the allocation made in 1991-92, 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95 to each of the states under different components of the programme?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL): (a) The implementation of Urban Poverty Alleviation Programme is reviewed periodically through meetings in Delhi and discussions at State Headquarters, in order to assess the achievement of targets and to take remedial measures to tackle shortfall, if any. The last such review has been in July, 1994. There is at present no proposal, as such, to broadbase the programme.

(b) Since the launching of the Urban Poverty Alleviation Programmes, which include Nehru Rozgar Yojana (NRY) and Urban Basic Services for the Poor (UBSP), following number of urban poor have been benefited under the two programmes as on 31.07.1994:

(i) NEHRU ROZGAR YOJANA

5.89 lakh beneficiaries have been assisted to set up self-employment ventuares and 500 lakh mandays of work have been generated under the Scheme of Wage Employment and Shelter Upgradation. Further 3.73 lakh dwelling units have been upgraded/being upgraded under the Scheme of Housing & Shelter Upgradation.

(ii) URBAN BASIC SERVICES FOR THE POOR

About 42.02 lakh low income women and children have been benefitted under this programme.

The performance under the Scheme of Urban Micro Enterprises exceeded the physical targets but faced difficulties because of certain factors like delay in disposal or heavy rejection of applications by Banks.

There has been a slight shortfall in the achievement of targets under the Scheme of Wage Employment. This has been due to some States not taking up labour intensive schemes.

The pace of implementation of the Scheme of Housing and Shelter Upgradation (SHASU) has been slow due to lack of initiative on the part of the State Governments in furnishing block guarantees on behalf of Urban Local Bodies for fear of non-recovery or poor recovery of loan amount. State Governments/ Union Territories are also slow in completing the post sanction/documentation formalities prescribed by Housing and Urban Development Corporation.

One of the main objectives of the UBSP Programme is convergence of different sectoral programmes for all the urban poor through a system of coordinated based assessment, planning, monitoring and service delivery at city and community level. However, despite recognition, efforts to operationalise this concept have been limited. The UBSP strategy of organising communities and creating legitimate community-based structures and facilitating systematic planning at the community and city level is one of the few attempts to bridge this gap.

(c) The State-wise allocation of funds under the Nehru Rozar Yojana and the Urban Basic Services for the poor for the years 1991-92, 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994- 95 is given in the enclosed statements I & II respectively.

Statement-I

Nehru Rozgar Yojana

Details showing Central Funds released to various States / UTs during 1991-92, 1992-93, 1993-94 and Tentative Allocation during 1994-95 under NRY.

(Rupees in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Names of State / UT	1991-92 Actual release	1992-93 Actual release	1993-94 Actual release	1994-95 Tentative allocation
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	794.80	527.40	679.53	508.90
2.	Bihar	670.50	457.35	359.30	524.20
3.	Gujarat	291.15	198.45	212.52	246.40
4.	Haryana	163.70	111.90	123.29	106.30
5.	Karnataka	793.50	510.20	440.17	488.90
6.	Kerala	318.80	225.90	234.82	206.50
7.	Madhya Pradesh	797.80	550.40	684.48	509.30
8.	Maharashtra	1018.10	700.50	669.60	608.60
9.	Orissa	281.70	191.60	219.80	168.50
10.	Punjab	270.80	192.90	216.47	165.60
11.	Rajasthan	561.10	309.40	379.60	327.60
12.	Tamil Nadu	892.90	587.00	765.58	586.70
13.	Uttar Pradesh	2092.90	1426.20	1711.54	1308.30

1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	West Bengal	561.10	481.20	259.00	459.80
15.	Goa	37.90	19.70	17.85	20.00
16.	Arunachal Pd.	31.50	16.60	19.75	60.55
17.	Assam	187.50	156.20	89.49	164.75
18.	Himachal Pd	70.90	64.50	56.19	74.95
19.	Jammu & Kashmir	91.10	86.50	87.48	80.05
20.	Manipur	49.50	40.90	43.33	57.50
21.	Meghalaya	47.20	37.45	24.10	35.50
22.	Mizoram	34.60	24.30	21.74	25.60
23.	Nagaland	38.20	19.20	15.70	50.35
24.	Sikkim	27.90	34.20	29.68	27.60
25.	Tripura	34.50	25.20	25.60	25.50
26.	A&N Islands	11.90	9.20	13.53	19.15
27.	Chandigarh	21.70	12.20	13.86	17.70
28.	D&N Haveli	10.80	8.40	11.05	11.80
29.	Daman & Diu	18.70	15.10	18.25	22.50
30.	Pondicherry	17.70	17.90	11.70	30.70
31.	Delhi	40.00	22.00	22.00	40.00
32.	Central Govt.Salary etc.	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
	Total	10300.00	7099.75	7497.00	7000.00

Statement-II

Urban Basic Services for the Poor (UBSP)Details showing central funds released to various States / UTs during 1991-92, 1992-93, 1993-94 and Tentative Allocation during 1994-95 under (UBSP)

(Rupees in lakhs)

S.No.	Names of State / UT	1991-92 Actual release	1992-93 Actual release	1993-94 Actual release	1994-95 Tentative allocation
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	180.00	91.20	142.15	129.60
2.	Bihar	149.50	81.05	115.05	115.05
3.	Gujarat	103.36	44.60	69.60	63.45
4.	Haryana	25.64	12.65	17.70	17.70
5.	Karnataka	148.30	77.85	121.20	110.50
6.	Kerala	72.70	35.10	54.60	49.80
7.	Madhya Pradesh	150.30	82.75	128.80	117.45
8.	Maharashtra	215.80	125.35	195.25	178.05
9.	Orissa	75.06	23.30	33.05	33.05
10.	Punjab	59.15	24.00	34.05	34.05
11.	Rajasthan	95.26	47.50	73.95	67.45
12.	Tamil Nadu	205.70	118.00	183.80	167.60
13.	Uttar Pradesh	357.60	203.20	316.45	288.55
14.	West Bengal	165.70	92.35	131.15	131.15
15.	Goa	13.50	9.00	11.00	11.00
16.	Araunachal Pd.	13.50	9.00	—	11.00
17.	Assam	20.65	11.45	15.90	15.90
18.	Himachal Pd.	20.60	9.00	11.00	11.00

1	2	3	4	5	6
19.	Jammu & Kashmir	17.28	9.00	11.00	11.00
20.	Manipur	15.08	9.00	11.00	11.00
21.	Meghalaya	13.50	9.00	11.00	11.00
22.	Mizoram	13.50	9.00	11.00	11.00
23.	Nagaland	13.50	9.00	—	11.00
24.	Sikkim	13.50	9.00	11.00	11.00
25.	Tripura	16.00	9.00	11.00	11.00
26.	A&N Islands	11.20	15.00	18.30	18.30
27.	Chandigarh	14.20	15.00	—	18.30
28.	D&N Haveli	11.20	15.00	—	18.30
29.	Daman & Diu	11.20	15.00	—	18.30
30.	Pondicherry	13.78	9.00	11.00	11.00
31.	Delhi	48.74	30.65	—	36.45
32.	NGO assistance directly from the ministry.	—	—	30.00	30.00
33.	Central Govt. Salary etc.	15.00	15.00	20.00	20.00
	Grand Total	2300.00	1275.00	1800.00	1800.00

Contracts awarded by DDA

*379. SHRI O.P. KOHLI: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Delhi Development Authority had awarded contracts without inviting tenders in the years 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993 and from January to July 1994;

(b) if so, the number of such contracts awarded year-wise and the amount involved therein year-wise;

(c) the reasons for awarding the contracts without inviting tenders;

(d) the action taken against the erring/guilty officials and details thereof, official-wise; and

(e) the steps taken to check the awarding of contracts without calling tenders?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The number of such contracts awarded, year-wise, and the amount involved therein, year-wise, are as under:—

Year	No. of contracts awarded	Amount involved
		Rs. in crores
1990-91	2,488	9.22
1991-92	2,228	9.84
1992-93	2,139	11.82
1993-94	1,608	7.45
4/94 to 7/94	434	1.73

(c) The Delhi Development Authority has reported that, as far as possible, works are awarded after call of tenders completion of codal formalities. However, the C.P.W.D. Manual, which DDA generally follows, provides that, in emergent cases or when the interest of work demands, works can be awarded without call of tenders after these are approved by the competent authority as per the Financial Delegation of Powers. The precise nature of emergency involved is required to be recorded by the Divisional Officer before dispensing with call of tenders.

(d) The DDA has reported that action is taken against concerned officials in case it is found that the powers delegated have either been misused or exceeded. During the period in question, on grounds of misuse of authority delegated, major penalty proceedings charge sheets have been issued to one Superintending Engineer and one Executive Engineer. In addition, recordable warnings have been issued to one Superintending Engineer, four Executive Engineers and two Asstt. Accounts Officers. The case of an Accountant, who was on deputation to DDA, has been sent to his parent Department for issue of recordable warning to him.